



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

body and blood should be in so small a space, or in more places than one at the same time.

Their Bible assures them, that *with God all things are possible* (Matt. xix. 26), *even for a camel to go through the eye of a needle*.—Verse 24. *With men this is impossible*, says our Saviour, *but not with God; for with God all things are possible*.—Mark x. 27. Nor is it harder with God for one body to be at once in two places, than for two bodies to be in one place, as when our Saviour came in to his disciples, *the doors being shut*.—John xx. 19, 26.

REPLY.—Any Protestants who should refuse to believe anything that is clearly revealed by the Most High, because they cannot understand *how* it is possible, would certainly be very presumptuous. But it is surely no more than reasonable to require particularly strong proof of anything which at least seems contradictory, and which is not confirmed either by our own senses or by any one's else.

When Jesus appeared "in the midst of the disciples," the "doors being shut," they could not, of course, tell whether the door had been miraculously opened and shut again without their seeing or observing it, or in what other way their Master had entered; but their own senses witnessed that he actually was there in his own natural body; and we believe this on their testimony. This is, at least, a very different thing—supposing both to be true—from believing the body of our Lord to be, at the same time, in heaven and on a thousand different altars on earth.

OBJECTION 31.—Protestants maintain that there is a necessity of receiving the sacrament in *both kinds* in order to life everlasting.

Their own Bible expressly promises eternal life to them that receive in *one kind only*.—John vi. 58. *He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever*. And verse 57.—*He that eateth me, even he shall live by me*.

REPLY.—Neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics can suppose that a man's salvation can be secured by his merely receiving the sacrament, either in one kind or in both. None of them, therefore, can believe that this was our Lord's meaning. It is plain, therefore, to all—Protestants and Roman Catholics—that He must have meant more than this, when He speaks of "eating of Him." He must have meant to include *faith* in Him, and *love* for Him, shown in "keeping his commandments" (see John xiv. 15)—in short, the whole Christian life.

But most Protestants think it presumptuous to depart from the mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper which was used (as all admit) by the apostles, and by all the early Christians, for many ages. And Roman Catholics would probably think the same, if they were aware not only of this fact, but also that one of the earlier Popes pronounced it sacrilege to administer the bread without the cup to any of the communicants.

OBJECTION 32.—Protestants deny that there is any true and proper sacrifice in the church of Christ, to be offered in *all places* to the name of God.

Their Bible affirms it (Mal. i. 10, 11), where, rejecting the Jewish sacrifices, God declares his acceptance of that sacrifice, or *pure offering*, which should be made to Him in *every place* among the Gentiles. *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering*. Which cannot be understood of the sacrifice of the cross, which was offered but once, and in one place, and that among the Jews, not among the Gentiles.

REPLY.—This is a mistake. All Christians, of whatever denomination, hold that sacrifices are to be offered up to God continually. The only question is, *what* the sacrifices should be.

1. The offering of slain beasts, which was an ordinance of the Jewish law, all Christians are agreed to reject, as not belonging to the Gospel dispensation.

2. The offering up of *ourselves*, as a kind of sacrifice to God, we find expressly enjoined in the Christian Scriptures—"I beseech you," says the Apostle Paul (Rom. xii.), "that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God."

3. The sacrifice of Christ's body, for the redemption of the world, is very expressly, and strongly, and frequently spoken of in Scripture as having taken place "once for all," and as not being to be repeated, but only commemorated; and its perfection and sufficiency are inferred in Scripture, from its *not* being repeated, and from there being "no more sacrifice for sin" needed or allowed.

4. The offering of incense, in a literal sense, is nowhere alluded to in the Christian Scriptures, and seems to have been quite unknown in the early Christian Church.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

DID OUR SAVIOUR INSTITUTE SEVEN SACRAMENTS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—In looking over Dr. J. Butler's Catechism, the other day, my eye caught the following question and an-

swer:—"How many sacraments are there? A. Seven." What! thought I, seven sacraments! How is this? I read in the New Testament of only *two*—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These I know, and can prove, were instituted by Christ himself, and left obligations on his Church. Being at a loss to know where the Church of Rome got the *other five*, I again looked at Dr. Butler's Catechism.

I thought to myself, since a sacrament must be ordained by Christ himself, surely Dr. B. will give us his very words; nothing else will satisfy me. Well, judge of my surprise, instead of referring me to the Scriptures written by the Apostles, and giving me chapter and verse, Dr. B. refers me to the Council of Trent, SS. 7, can. 1—that is, Dr. Butler says there are seven sacraments, because the Council of Trent says so.

Not being satisfied with this, and being curious to get all the proof the Church of Rome is able to advance on the point, I turned to the decrees of the Council of Trent. Here is the Canon referred to—"Whosoever shall affirm that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Christ Jesus our Lord, or that they are more or fewer than seven, let him be accursed."

Now, the inquiry looked more serious. To be eternally cursed is awful even to think of. I then became doubly anxious to find out on what grounds the Council affirmed that "the sacraments were neither more nor fewer than seven." As yet not a particle of Scripture had been quoted in proof.

Thinking that the legates, the patriarchs, the bishops, and the divines (who drew up and sanctioned the canon referred to, as deciding the point) had, when discussing the subject, given Scriptural proof in its support, I took up the history of the Council, and examined the speeches of the Fathers; but still without success. It is true some divines argued that seven is a perfect number—that there are seven days in the week—seven excellent virtues—seven deadly sins—and seven planets—and so concluded that there must also be seven sacraments. Such reasoning was irresistible; with me it had the opposite effect.

I now took up the Catechism of the Council of Trent—that standard authority—out of which the priests are educated at Maynooth. Thinks I to myself, although Dr. Butler or the Fathers at Trent would not satisfy the laity with the verses in the Scripture which prove that our Saviour instituted seven sacraments, surely the priests will be favoured with the Scripture proof. I began to think I was right in my conjecture when I read the following statement in the catechism:—"The Sacraments of the Catholic Church are seven, as is proved FROM SCRIPTURE, from the unbroken traditions of the Fathers, and from the authoritative definitions of Councils."

Now, thought I, we must be near it; Scripture is at last referred to, as proving the point. Let us have the passage; if we have Scripture proof the point is settled: we won't require tradition or the councils, no more than the Almighty Creator required the help of men or angels in creating the world. His word was sufficient to create all things, and so his word written is sufficient to prove that there are seven sacraments.

Well, I looked anxiously through the catechism; I turned over page after page, to find out the particular book, chapter, and verse so confidently referred to, but I searched in vain. No Scripture proof is given; a witness is mentioned, but the witness is not brought forward; his testimony is not given. The natural conclusion is, that he has nothing favourable to say for the parties who keep him back.

Whilst looking for the Scripture proof, I met a note in the catechism, referring me to "C. of Trent 887, Can. 1; and to the Council of Florence."

I stopped and considered the references; I found that I had examined the first already without success; but, on looking at the second, a gleam of hope passed over my mind. Oh, thought I, the Council of Florence was held A.D. 1442, and is earlier authority than any yet examined; perhaps it has given the Scripture proof. I turned to the decree; it simply states—"The Sacraments of the New Law are seven." How provoking! I exclaimed; still no Scripture. All the authorities referred to state, that there are seven sacraments instituted by Christ; but none of them prove the fact by the only witnesses who can prove it—the Apostles or the Evangelists.

But, some Roman Catholic layman will say, why did you not examine Peter Dens on the subject? he is high authority at Maynooth. Well, so I did, but with no better success, as will appear by the following quotation from his work:—"The number seven (says Dens) is insinuated in various places in Scripture, thus, in Prov. 9.—'Wisdom hath built her house' (that is, the Church), and hath cut out her seven pillars—to wit, the seven sacraments, which as so many pillars sustain the Church. Thus (he adds) in like manner, in Exod. xxv., by the seven lights which were in one candlestick, this is insinuated, for the seven sacraments are so many lights which illumine the Church."—Dens's Theol. Num. Sac. So, after all, according to Dens, we have nothing but "insinuations," taken from the Old Testament, to prove that our Saviour instituted seven sacraments.

Dr. Doyle's Christian Doctrine was now put into my hands, that I might examine what he says, and the proofs which he brings forward. I found that he, like the rest, asserts that "there are seven sacraments, and refers his readers to the C. of Trent, SS. 7, Can. 1." Finding this authority referred to so often, and remembering that it pronounces a curse on all who affirm the contrary, it seemed to me that the supporters of the doctrine of seven sacraments relied more on the terror to be excited through fear of a curse, to establish her point, than on Scriptural authority.

But as cursing had no effect on me, I still searched for the Scripture proofs, and the next book I read was Dr. Doyle's, and I was greatly pleased with his answer to the question—"Where did Christ give us a command to baptize? A. In St. Matt. xxviii. 20." I liked that; it was Scripture authority. Thinks I to myself perhaps the doctor gives the Scripture proofs for his statement, that there are seven sacraments. I looked first at the chapter on Confirmation, and read—"Q. When did Christ ordain this sacrament? A. The time is not certain; but divines, most probably, hold it was instituted at Christ's last supper, or between his resurrection and ascension." I turned then to the chapter on Extreme Unction, and read—"Q. When did Christ institute it? A. The time is uncertain; some think it was instituted at the Last Supper," &c. Further on I read—"Q. When was matrimony made a Sacrament of the New Law? A. Where and when Christ instituted this sacrament is uncertain," &c.

If I wanted anything to convince me that there was no Scripture authority for the doctrine of seven sacraments Dr. Doyle's admissions, just quoted, would be sufficient. With all his learning he could not find or quote a passage of Scripture on the subject.

Lieberman, a Roman divine, instead of searching for Scripture, is content with saying—"The Church says it;" which, after all, comes only to this—you must believe there are seven sacraments, because the Church of Rome says it is proved by Scripture, whether it is so or not.

I was now convinced that our Saviour did not institute seven sacraments; and, on looking into history, I there found that Peter Lombard, a writer of the 12th century, was the first to reckon seven sacraments, and that this invention gained ground in the subsequent centuries until, at last, it took its present form. J. F. G.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—Engaged in the disquisition of truth, and especially with an adversary pledged, as you are, to a full, fair, candid, and impartial investigation of arguments, I shall premise no apologies for offering a few remarks on some of the leading articles of your journal. By the bye, I have a great antipathy to dishonest and disingenuous argumentation, though such sophisticating may give a temporary triumph over an inferior antagonist; but we shall only thus impose on ourselves and others. Truth does not need such subterfuges—"Nec defensoribus istis. Magna est veritas et prevalebit."

In the September number of your periodical you say, respecting the visibility of the Church of Christ, that it was always visible. Let me require of you to point out the locus of its existence in the days of Berengarius. He was bound, of course, to hear the church (Mat. xviii. 17), to obey his prelates and follow their faith.—Heb. xiii. 7, 17. Did he then, and who were these prelates? Will you, Mr. Editor, be able to overlook that obstacle? We find churches, councils, bishops, ecclesiastics and friends exhorting him to obedience, and he would not. Were they or he the Church of Christ? "Utrum horum mavis accipe." If he was the church, he recanted, and abjured all his Protestantism towards the close of life. Where was the church then, as well as before he began to broach his new dogmas, about the year 1040? Now, sir, I have you impaled (as they say) on the horns of a dilemma. You have chosen the other alternative; for you say, in reply to objections nine and ten of the "Touchstone," "that the Christian Church" (that is, the churches in communion with Rome, for there were no other, except you make Berenger the church) had never wholly revolted, that God's Spirit never abandoned her, that God had not cast her off, that the fundamentals of Christianity were preserved in that church termed (by modern Protestant controversialists) "the mother of harlots and abominations, the scarlet Lady, drunken with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus, the mystery of iniquity, the man of sin, whom the Lord shall destroy with the spirit of his mouth." In conclusion, the 19th article of your church defines the visible Church of Christ to be "a congregation of faithful men (mind that), in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance."

For as much as you will signally fail to point out, at the period I have selected, any such congregation, however small, with which you can consistently identify yourself; and inasmuch as this scarlet Lady of ours, this mother of whores, had been sunk in gross and abominable idolatry for 800 years and more, I assert that, according to your principles, the pure Word of God could not have been preached or the sacraments duly

administered, that there was no visible Church of Christ, that the gates of hell must have prevailed against it, that our dear and blessed Redeemer could not, upon your principles, be the true Messiah, and that your system leads to absolute infidelity. There is a climax for you, Mr. Editor. If you affect to despise or attempt to evade these arguments, I will be at liberty to construe such conduct into inability; but if, without turning to the right hand, or to the left, you grapple manfully with them, you shall hear from me again. In the meantime,

I remain, with Christian charity,

PHILAETHES.

P.S.—To the second portion of my letter I would more particularly direct your attention—namely, the visibility of the church.

We have not published the whole of the above letter, for this reason—we have already stated to our correspondents, that it is essential that each letter addressed to us should be confined to some one subject. The limits of our paper render it necessary to adhere to this rule. We, therefore, publish "Philaethes's" account of himself, and that part of his letter which he especially calls on us to answer. The part which we have omitted relates to a quite different subject, the passage in the Book of Maccabees, and contains nothing which we have not answered already. We therefore apply ourselves, as "Philaethes" himself requires, to what he says of the visibility of the church.

Proofs from Scripture are entitled to the greatest attention from us. "Philaethes" quotes Matt. xviii. 17; but, if he will look at the place in his Douay Bible, he will see that it relates merely to offences of one man against another man—"If thy brother shall offend against thee." It is of that case only that our Saviour says—"Hear the Church," for the church should strive to reconcile brethren, and bring them into peace and love with each other.

"Philaethes" quotes also Hebrews xiii. 7 and 17—"Obey your prelates, and follow their faith." Now, here we must insist on coming to an understanding with "Philaethes" on the real meaning of this precept. Does it mean that whatever faith the prelates we happen to be under may choose to adopt, that we are bound to follow his faith? Or, is it to be understood with the limitation which St. Paul elsewhere lays upon our following himself—"Wherefore I beseech you to be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ."—1 Cor. iv. 16. But we are not to follow even Paul, except as he followed Christ, for he says—"Though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema."—Galatians, i. 8.

We call upon "Philaethes" to say whether he does or does not admit that a difference must be made between the "faith of the church" and the opinions and doctrines of particular bishops and doctors. To help him to answer this we give him an instance:—

Azorius, one of the greatest doctors of the Church of Rome, says—"The image is to be worshipped with the same honour and worship with which we worship those whose image it is." And this was not merely a singular opinion of his own, for he says further—"This is the constant sense of the divines."—*Instit. Moral.* par. 1, Lib. 9, c. 6. And we could give a long list of the most celebrated divines in the Church of Rome who have said the same. We could even go farther, for the pontifical published by authority of Pope Clement VIII. contains these words—"The legate's cross must be on the right hand, because latria, or Divine honour, is due to it."—*Edit. Roman.* p. 672. And Almaine says—"The images of the Trinity and of the cross are to be adored with the worship of latria."

Is "Philaethes" a "worshipper of images?" We trust he is not. But if we should charge him with it, on the ground that a multitude of the greatest doctors and teachers of the Church of Rome have actually taught it, and that he, as a Roman Catholic, is bound to follow their faith, how would he answer us? Would he not say that these things were the errors of individuals, and not the doctrines and faith of the church? Would he not say this, even of that worship of the legate's cross which was sanctioned by Pope Clement VIII.?

Well, then, we ask, How are we to distinguish that this doctrine is really an error of individuals, and not the faith of the Roman Catholic Church? What answer will he give to this? Will he say that he knows it, because this doctrine was never decreed by a general council? He cannot say this, because this very doctrine was actually decreed by the second Council of Nice, in the year 787, which all Roman Catholics hold to be a general council. These are the words of the council—"These precious and venerable images, as is aforesaid, we honour and salute, and honouring, we adore them"—that is to say, the image of the humanity of the great God, and of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, and of our holy and undefiled lady, the Mother of God . . . also the images of the saints and incorporeal angels," &c., &c.—*Concilia Generalia*, Labbe and Cossart, vol. vii., p. 332.

* "Thou shalt not adore them."—God's commandment in the Douay Bible.—Exodus xx. 5.

Now, how will "Philaethes" show us that "adoring images" is not a doctrine of the Catholic Church, but only an error of particular doctors and bishops, and councils? Can he make any answer now but this, that there never was any such thing in any of the Catholic creeds, in which the church taught and declared her faith?

We think this answer a very good one: only we are puzzled to understand how any one who holds the Creed of Pope Pius IV. can venture to give such an answer; for one of the articles of that creed is as follows—"All other things delivered, defined, and decreed by the general councils, I, without doubt, receive and profess." How can any one who professes this refuse to "adore images?" We submit this to "Philaethes's" consideration.

But now to apply this principle to the visibility of the church in the time of Berengarius—that is, in the eleventh century. We look to the creeds of the Catholic Church in that age, and we do not find in any of them the doctrine which the Pope and some bishops sought to force on Berengarius. We, therefore, conclude that the doctrine in question was not any part of the faith of the church, but only a private opinion of that Pope and those bishops.

We find that "the church" then held precisely the same creeds which the Church of England and Ireland holds now. These creeds were the public authorized testimony of the church, as a church, to what she held as the Catholic faith. Any errors then prevailing among particular bishops were not in the creeds of the church, and, therefore, were not the faith of the church; and, therefore, notwithstanding the errors of individual bishops, we have no difficulty in acknowledging at that time both the faith and the visibility of the church, while condemning and rejecting the errors which were held by individuals.

We have shown that this principle—"that the faith of the church is delivered in the public creeds of the church, and in them alone"—is the only one that can at once enable us to be Catholics, and yet preserve us from being "worshippers of images." On that great principle we, who hold to the ancient Catholic creeds, as the declaration of our faith, have no difficulty in showing the perpetuity and visibility of the Church of Christ.

But can those who hold the Creed of Pope Pius IV. show the perpetuity and visibility of the church on the same principle? It is clear that they cannot; for if the creed of Pope Pius be, as it professes, "the Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved," then, surely, it was necessary that there should have been in every age a visible church professing that creed. Surely "Philaethes" must know that no church on earth even professed that compilation of Pope Pius as its creed until the Roman Church did so in 1563. If that creed be indeed "the Catholic faith," where was the visibility of a church professing it for 1500 years?

We trust "Philaethes" will give a candid consideration to a principle which will enable him to hold the perpetuity and visibility of the church, without being involved in "worshipping images" and other such things; in other words, a principle which will enable him to be a true Catholic, following the apostles, bishops, and martyrs "as they followed Christ," and not otherwise.

We shall be glad to hear from "Philaethes" again, provided he will confine each letter to one subject. And we would suggest to him to write less boastfully: we always try to avoid vain boasting ourselves, and our correspondents would do well to follow our example in this.

We have to thank "Philaethes" for his private letter, in which he gives us his name, and informs us that he was educated for the priesthood, giving us, at the same time, sufficient reference to vouch for his statement. The fact of his education, of course, renders him a desirable correspondent for us.

THE SIN OF JEROBOAM.

MR. EDITOR—Reading in your last number (December) of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN the letters of your correspondents, "Petitor Fontium" and "A Retired East Indian," on the subject of the Roman Catholic view of the second commandment and practice of image worship, it occurred to me it might be useful towards the farther elucidation of the important question, whether the Church of Rome in that view and practice be opposed to the Bible or not, to follow out and add something to the Scriptural evidence adduced by your latter correspondent. He very justly argues, that the golden calves, made by Aaron, were intended to be representations of Jehovah—the God of Israel—from the words addressed by him to the people, in the ceremony of exhibiting the images to their view—"These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," plainly implying it was no new object of worship he was setting up, but only a visible representation of Jehovah, whom they had chosen to be their God, and "who had brought them up out of the land of Egypt;" and also from the still plainer words—"To-morrow is a feast to the Lord," meaning thereby the feast of the dedication of that image to his honour. Yet, we know that Aaron and the people were guilty

of a grievous sin in making and bowing before this image, though intended by them to be a representation of the true God; and St. Paul charges them with idolatry—1 Cor. x. 7. (I quote from the Douay Bible)—"Neither become ye idolaters, as some of them. As it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play." From this passage in that Bible there is a reference to Exod. xxxii. 6, showing that the translators or commentators were fully aware that the Apostle alluded to Aaron's sin.

Again, in Deut. iv. 15, 16 (Douay version), the Israelites are exhorted thus—"Keep, therefore, your souls carefully. You saw not any similitude in the day that the Lord God spoke to you in Horeb from the midst of the fire, lest, perhaps, being deceived, you might make you a graven similitude." Thus it appears, while they were allowed to hear the voice of the true God, they were not permitted to see a *similitude* of him, lest they might be tempted to make a copy, or a graven image of Jehovah, according to the similitude, for religious use and adoration.

The next proof is taken from the sin of Jeroboam, of whom it is said—"He made Israel to sin." In the Douay Bible (3 Kings xii. 28, 30) the following account is given of it:—"And finding out a device"—that is, to prevent any of the ten tribes going up to Jerusalem to worship, according to their previous custom, and of the political effects of which he was much afraid—"he made two golden calves, and said to them, Go ye up no more to Jerusalem; behold thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. And he set the one in Bethel, and the other in Dan, and this thing became an occasion of sin, for the people went to adore the calf as far as Dan."

There is a note at the bottom of the page, on the first of these verses, in the following words—"Tis likely, by making his god in this form, he mimicked the Egyptians, among whom he had sojourned, who worshipped their Apis and Osiris under the form of a bullock." But I would venture to suggest, is it not more "likely" that he imitated Aaron, since not only the material and form were precisely the same, but the words of proclamation also? In the above note, though it is not expressly said that Jeroboam set up false gods as objects of adoration, yet the impression left on the mind of the reader is, perhaps, that he did. However this be, it is very material to our argument to determine the precise nature of Jeroboam's sin. Accordingly we turn to 3 Kings xv. 31 (Douay Bible), and find it declared that "it was not enough for him [that is, for Achab] to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nabat, but he also took to wife Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, King of the Zidonians, and he went and served Baal." From this passage it appears that Achab's sin was different from, and much worse than Jeroboam's. We are also plainly told what Achab's sin was—that it was serving the false god, Baal. What, then, was Jeroboam's? Was it, too, the worship of a false god? If so, where was the difference between them? Could the worship of one false god be so different from, and so much worse than that of another, as to call for the strong reprehension of the sacred writer? The doctrine of Holy Scripture is not so. There the pretended deities are put all upon the same level, and their worshippers are characterized as alike contemptible and wicked—"They that make them are like unto them, and so are all they that put their trust in them."

But if this be disputed, there is further evidence sufficient to settle the question, and determine unanswerably the precise nature of Jeroboam's sin. This proof is taken from the case of Jehu, another of the kings of the ten tribes. From his history we learn that he was specially appointed by Jehovah to punish the house of Achab for their sin in serving Baal.—See 4 Kings ix. 6, 7. In the same chapter there is an account of his commencing the execution of the sacred task thus intrusted to him. In the following chapter (15, 16 verses) is related the meeting of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, with Jehu, while engaged in his enterprize, and Jehu's inviting him to come up into his chariot, and saying to him, "Come, see my zeal for the Lord." The succeeding verses, which it would occupy too much space to quote in full, tell us that "Jehu slew all that were left of Achab in Samaria," and describe minutely, also, how he destroyed the worshippers of Baal, which is summed up thus in 28th verse—"So Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel." He is commended for his courage and faithfulness in fulfilling the commission intrusted to him, and promises are given of the continuance of his descendants on the throne of Israel for several generations. Most unquestionably Jehu is described as the champion of the true God—Jehovah, the God of Israel, against the false God, Baal. Nevertheless, what is said of him in the 29th verse? "But yet he (Jehu) departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nabat, who made Israel to sin, nor did he forsake the golden calves that were in Bethel and in Dan."

The conclusion, then, is inevitable, that Jehu's and, consequently, Jeroboam's sin consisted not in worshipping false gods, but in making and venerating images of the Lord. It appears to me to be rigidly demonstrated, and it follows as clearly that the Church of Rome, in sanctioning the use and veneration of images